UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address : COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
07/640,489	01/11/91	BRANSCOMB H	ADIN-7914-MA

EXAMINER	
LUU, M	

MARK A. HAYNES
FLIESLER, DUBB, MEYER & LOVEJOY
FOUR EMBARCADERO CTR., STE. 400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-4156

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2609	4

DATE MAILED: 04/16/92

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), ~~_____ days~~ from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. ☒ Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
2. ☒ Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.
3. ☐ Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
4. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152.
5. ☐ Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
6. ☐ _____

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1 - 13 are pending in the application.
   Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1 - 13 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable. ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____ has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner. ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____, has been ☐ approved. ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

1. This application has been examined.

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the associating tags means as recited in claims 1 and 7. The associating positions means as recited claims 1 and 7. Means for selecting a position (claims≤2 and 6) and means for accessing the framers of video data (claims≤2 and 6). Means coupled to the controlled means and the control means (claim 5, page 31, lines 1-3) must be shown or the feature canceled from the claim. No new matter should be entered.

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to provide an adequate written description of the invention. The applicant has failed to disclose the exact "means for associating tags with frames of video data..." as recited in claims 1 and 7. What exactly is this associating tags means. How is the associating means coupled to the storage means and the processing means. What exactly is the associating positions means as recited in claims 1 and 7. What

exactly is the "means for selecting a position" as recited in claim 2, and "means for accessing". How is the "means for accessing the frames" connected to the "means for selecting a position" and the "means for associating positions" as recited in claims 2 and 6. In claim 3, the applicant recited" processing means, coupled to the controllable means and the control means, for associating frames..". (page 30, lines 13-15), and also in claim 5 which depends on claim 3, the applicant recited "means coupled to the controllable means and the control means, for ..." (page 31, lines 1-3) which is exactly the recited "processor means" in claim 3. Is this "means coupled ..." the processor means. What exactly is this "means coupled ... video image" as recited in claim 5.

4. Claims 1-2 and 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1, 2, 7, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Naimark et al. (4,857,902).

As per claims 1 and 7, as best understood, Naimark discloses

(FIGS. 1, 2 and 5) an apparatus for assembling content addressable video which comprises a storage means (51) (frame buffer), an associating tags means (FIG. 1) (the data space), a processing means (50) (computer), and means for associating positions (the data space table) (col. 8, lines 44-63).

As per claims 2 and 8, Naimark discloses (fig. 5) means for selecting a position (53) (trackball), and means (50) (computer) for accessing the frames of video data in the storage means (51) (frame buffer).

As per claim 9, Naimark further discloses (FIGS. 1-2) the subset of the plurality of frames (N14, N15, N8, N9) is the subset of frame (N4).

7. Claims 3, 5, 6, 10, and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Morgan (4,992,866).

As per claims 3 and 10, Morgan (FIGS. 1 and 2) means (30) (touch screen) for generating a content video image representative, an organization of content addressable video, control means (20) (32) (processor) (video switcher) for generating control signals (col. 3, lines 49-58), controllable means (80) (34) (remote cameras and controllers) for generating frames of video data (col. 3, lines 34-58), and the processor means (20) for associating frames of video data generated by the controllable means.

As per claims 5 and 12, Morgan further discloses (FIG. 2) a

storage means (processor), coupled to the controllable means (80) (34), for storing frames of video data generated by controllable means (col. 3, lines 42-48), and means (20) (processor) coupled to the controllable means (80) (34) and control means (32) (20), for associating the address of each frame of video data with a position in the content video image (col. 3, lines 34-58).

As per claims 6 and 13, Morgan discloses (Figs. 1 and 2) means for selecting a position in the content video image (20) (44), and means (20) (processor) for accessing the frames of video data in the storage means in response to selected positions (col. 2, line 63 to col. 3, line 19).

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
>
> Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

8. Claims 4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Morgan in view of International Conference on

Advanced Robotics (85 ICAR) Toshiba corporation (Sept. 13, 1985).

Claim 4 and 11 are considered rejected as set forth above, regarding to claims 3 and 10, with the exception of robot mounted video camera.

However, Toshiba Corporation discloses (FIG. 4) a robot mounted video camera which is controlled by the computer input device (tablet). It would have been obvious to incorporate the robot mounted video camera of Toshiba Corporation into the camera selection and positioning system of Morgan since this is well-know in the art.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

McGee discloses a method of using robot arm camera for determining the position and orientation of an object in 3-D space.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Matthew Luu at telephone number (703) 308-0320.

M.L.
M. LUU:RWM
April 15, 1992

ULYSSES WELDON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 260